## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

George Booker, : CIVIL ACTION

Petitioner :

.

v. :

.

Donald T. Vaughn, et al., : No. 02-CV-4481

Respondent :

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

JAMES R. MELINSON CHIEF U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Before this court is a *pro se* petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The petitioner, George Booker, is presently incarcerated at the State Correction Institution at Graterford. For the reasons set forth below, this court recommends that the petition be DENIED for lack of jurisdiction.

Booker filed a previous *habeas* petition in this court on December 26, 1996. After reviewing his claims on the merits, the petition was dismissed with prejudice. <u>Booker v. Vaughn</u>, 96-CV-8625 (J. Thomas O'Neill, Jr., 7/16/97). Under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3) "[b]efore a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application." There is nothing contained in this record to indicate that Booker received such authorization.

Accordingly, this court makes the following:

## RECOMMENDATION

AND NOW, this day of August, 2002, IT IS RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDED that the petition for a writ of habeas corpus be DENIED for lack of jurisdiction. It is also RECOMMENDED that a certificate of appealability not be granted.

BY THE COURT:

JAMES R. MELINSON

CHIEF U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

George Booker, Petitioner	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
V.	:	
Donald T. Vaughn, et al., Respondent	: : :	No. 02-CV-4481
	0	RDER
THOMAS N. O'NEILL, JR., J	J.	
AND NOW, this	day of	, 2002, upon careful and independent
consideration of the petition for	r a writ of <i>habe</i>	as corpus, and after review of the Report and
Recommendation of Chief Uni	ted States Magi	istrate Judge James R. Melinson, IT IS ORDERED
that:		
1. The Report and Reco	ommendation is	APPROVED and ADOPTED.
2. The petition for a wi	rit of habeas co	rpus is DENIED for lack of jurisdiction.
3. There is no probable	e cause to issue	a certificate of appealability.
	BY THE	COURT:
	THOMA	AS N. O'NEILL, JR., J.